

### REMARKS

The Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to enter the presented amendments prior to the examination of the application. Claims 1, 8, 12, 16, and 21 have been amended. Claims 1-26 remain in the application. Consideration of the application as preliminarily amended is respectfully requested.

#### 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 5-8, 12, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,160,796 (hereinafter Zou).

Independent claim 1 includes a limitation of notifying a client requesting notification only that a specific change in a system occurred. Zou does not include such a limitation and therefore does not anticipate claim 1. Zou teaches a system where an object can request status information regarding a status of a bus (Col. 2, lines 8-11). Zou further teaches that the reported status information is a GUID table containing a list of either all devices that are currently on a bus, all devices that have been added to a bus, or all devices that have been removed from a bus (Col. 24, lines 15-47, Figs. 12A-C). When an object requests that this information be delivered to it, the object must receive the status information relating to all of the devices that have either been added or removed or all of the devices that are active. If, for example, an object wants information relating only to the status of certain devices, the object must receive the entire list and then filter the information (Col. 16, lines 39-41). Therefore, the system taught by Zou delivers information regarding all of the devices on the bus to all of the objects that have requested the information regardless of whether the object wants all of the information or not. It is then the responsibility of the object to filter the

information as it arrives. This can lead to inefficiencies because an object may often receive information that it does not need or want, and information that it does need must be filtered out from a larger set of information. Claim 1 includes a limitation that the client requesting notification is notified only that the specific change in the system occurred. This is not taught by Zou and as a result Zou does not anticipate claim 1.

Independent claims 8, 12, and 16 also include limitations that are not found in Zou. Therefore, independent claims 8, 12, and 16 are not anticipated by Zou. Further, claims 5-7 depend from claim 1. Therefore, claims 5-7 include all the limitations of claim 1. Because claim 1 is not anticipated by Zou, claims 5-7 are also not anticipated by Zou.

#### 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Examiner rejected claims 2-4, 9-11, 13-15, and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zou, in view of U.S. Patent 5,485,617 (hereinafter Stutz).

Claims 2-4, 9-11, 13-15, and 17-20 depend from previously discussed independent claims 1, 8, 12, and 16. Therefore, these dependent claims include the limitations of the corresponding independent claims. Stutz does not disclose the claim limitations which are not disclosed in Zou. Thus, the combination fails to form a proper prima facie case of obviousness and this rejection should be withdrawn.

The Examiner also rejected claims 21, and 24-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zou.

Claim 21 includes a limitation of notifying a first client requesting notification only that a first specific change in a USB occurred. This limitation is not taught by Zou and it is not obvious from Zou, and as a result claim 21 is

patentable over Zou. As noted above, the system taught by Zou notifies objects of changes in a bus by sending status information regarding all attached devices to all attached devices any time a bus reset occurs. All the objects receiving the information are then required to filter the information. Therefore, Zou does not teach notifying the first client requesting notification only that the first specific change in the USB occurred. As a result, claim 21 is patentable over Zou.

Claims 24-26 depend from independent claim 21. As a result claims 24-26 include all the limitations of independent claim 21. Because independent claim 21 is patentable over Zou, claims 24-26 are also patentable over Zou.

The Examiner also rejected claims 22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zou, in view of U.S. Patent 6,311,242 (hereinafter Falkenburg).

Claims 22 and 23 depend from independent claim 21. Therefore claims 22 and 23 include all the limitations of independent claim 21. Falkenburg does not disclose the claim limitations which are not disclosed in Zou. Thus, the combination fails to form a proper prima facie case of obviousness, and this rejection should be withdrawn. As a result claims 22 and 23 are patentable over Zou in view of Falkenburg.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call Arlen M. Hartounian at (408) 720-8300.

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'A. Hartounian', is written over a horizontal line.

Arlen M. Hartounian  
Reg. No. 52,997

Date: March 10, 2003

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(408) 720-8300

ATTACHMENT A

A marked-up version of the amended claims is as follows:

1. (Twice Amended) A method of notifying clients of a specific change in a system comprising:

a client requesting notification of the specific change in the system;  
detecting the specific change in the system; and  
notifying the client requesting notification only that the specific change in the system occurred.

8. (Twice Amended) A subsystem for notifying clients of a specific change in a system comprising:

means for a client to request notification of the specific change in the system; means for detecting the specific change in the system; and  
means for notifying the client requesting notification only that the specific change in the system occurred.

12. (Twice Amended) A machine-readable medium containing a plurality of executable instructions, which when executed on a processor cause said processor to perform a method of notifying clients of a specific change in a system, the method comprising:

a client requesting notification of the specific change in the system;  
detecting the specific change in the system; and  
notifying the client requesting notification only that the specific change in the system occurred.

16. (Twice Amended) A system comprising:

a processor;  
a memory;

a bus, the bus coupled to the processor, the bus coupled to the memory;  
and

the processor processing a request by a client for notification of a specific change in the system, the processor detecting the specific change in the system, and the processor notifying the client only that the specific change in the system has occurred.

21. (Three Times Amended) A method of notifying clients of a specific change in a Universal Serial Bus (USB) comprising:

a first client requesting notification of a first specific change in the USB;  
detecting the first specific change in the USB; and  
notifying the first client requesting notification only that the first specific change in the [use] USB occurred.